

REMARKS

This is responsive to the Office Action dated September 10, 2003 in which the Examiner rejects all the pending claims 1-18 as being obvious over combinations of Barnes ("10 Minute Guide To Windows 3.1", SAMS, 1992), Warmus et al (US Patent No. 6,327,599), Corona (US Patent No. 5,316,279) and Ikenoue et al (US Patent No. 5,987,127) under 35USC §103(a). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the Examiner as explained in detail below.

In particular, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion of the Examiner that the distinguishing feature "intercepting data in a document which is being sent to a printer from a print spool" is rendered obvious by a combination of Warmus and Barnes, as stated in Page 3 of the Office Action regarding claim 1. There is no teaching or implication in Warmus or Barnes that the data is intercepted after it arrives at the print spool. Warmus discloses a technique to create different versions of books, each of which comprises both common "fixed information" and different "variable information". As shown in Figure 5 in Warmus, the stripped variable page files 126 (or intermediate page files 130, 132) are used (or "intercepted" as read by the Examiner) to obtain the variable information from the database 108 so as to generate final variable page files 139. However, nowhere in Warmus can it be found a teaching or implication that the variable page files 126 (or intermediate page files 130, 132) is intercepted on its way from a print spool to a printer. In other words, there is no teaching or implication that the interception is done after the variable page files 126 (or intermediate page files 130, 132) have arrived in a print spool. The applicant is fully aware that a print spool is a common component of a print system, such as described in Barnes. However, a combination of Barnes with Warmus does not result in a system wherein data is intercepted on its way from a print spool to the printer. Warmus does not teach or suggest means for, or a step of, intercepting data which is being sent to a printer from a print spool, as recited in claim 1 as well as in

all other independent claims 5, 10, 11 and 15. To the contrary, as described in Warmus, variable page files 134, 136 are generated before they are sent to the print system 71, 79, and the press command file 140 is provided after the variable page files 138, 138 are generated (as clearly shown in Figure 5 and described in col. 8, lines 52-65). Thus, in Warmus, it is clear that the data (stripped variable page files 126) is intercepted before it reaches the print system 71, 79 (which may include a print spool from the teaching of Barnes). Since Warmus does not teach or suggest interception of variable page files between a print spool and printer, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Warmus with the teachings of Barnes. Accordingly, the combination of Warmus and Barnes is improper and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Even if such a combination were proper, which it is not, the combination of Warmus and Barnes does not result in a means or a step of intercepting data in a document which is being sent to a printer from a print spool, as recited in all independent claims 1, 5, 10, 11 and 15.

Similarly, combinations of Barnes and Warmus with Corona and/or Ikenoue do not result in the above-emphasized distinguishing feature, since neither Corona nor Ikenoue teaches or suggests to intercept the data which is being sent to a printer from a print spool. Therefore, the applicant believes that independent claims 1, 5, 10, 11 and 15 are patentable.

Moreover, claim 11 further defines that original data comprises two portions, and two documents are generated, one of which includes both portions, and another only includes one portion. Warmus does not teach or suggest this distinguishing feature. Warmus only discloses to add different new information onto the common template and thus to generate different documents, but does not teach that one document includes both portions of the original data while another document only includes a portion of the original data. Therefore, the patentability of claim 11 is clear.


At least for the same reasons, all the dependent claims 2-4, 6-9, 12-14 and 16-18 are also patentable.

The applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the above remarks and amendments. The Examiner is authorized to deduct additional fees believed due from our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Respectfully submitted,

KAPLAN & GILMAN, L.L.P.
900 Route 9 North
Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095
Telephone (732) 634-7634

Dated: December 10, 2003



Timothy X. Gibson
(Reg. No. 40,618)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal service as first class mail, in a postage prepaid envelope, addressed to Mail Stop Non-fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on December 10, 2003.

Dated December 10, 2003 Signed  Print Name Timothy X. Gibson